



# basic education

Department:  
Basic Education  
**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

## **NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE**

**GRADE 12**

**ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE P3**

**FEBRUARY/MARCH 2011**

**POSSIBLE ANSWERS**

**MARKS: 100**

**This memorandum consists of 7 pages.**

**INFORMATION FOR THE MARKER**

In assessing a candidate's work, the following aspects, among others, drawn from the assessment rubric, must be borne in mind:

- The overall effect of planning, drafting, proofreading and editing of the work on the final text produced
- Awareness of writing for a specific purpose, audience and context – as well as register, style and tone – especially in SECTIONS B and C
- Grammar, spelling and punctuation
- Language structures, including an awareness of critical language
- Choice of words and idiomatic language
- Sentence construction
- Paragraphing
- Interpretation of the topic that will be reflected in the overall content: introduction, development of ideas and conclusion

**SUGGESTED APPROACH TO MARKING****SECTION A: ESSAY**

Refer to SECTION A: Rubric for Assessing an Essay found on page 5 of this memorandum.

<b>CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
CONTENT AND PLANNING	30
LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING	15
STRUCTURE	5
TOTAL	50

1. Read the whole piece and decide on a category for CONTENT AND PLANNING.
2. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING.
3. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for STRUCTURE.

**SECTION B: LONGER TRANSACTIONAL TEXT**

Refer to SECTION B: Rubric for Assessing Longer Transactional Texts found on page 6 of this memorandum.

<b>CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT	18
LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING	12
TOTAL	30

1. Read the whole piece and decide on a category for CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT.
2. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING.

**SECTION C: SHORTER TEXT: TRANSACTIONAL/REFERENTIAL/INFORMATIONAL**

Refer to SECTION C: Rubric for Assessing Shorter Transactional/Referential/Transactional Texts found on page 7 of this memorandum.

<b>CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT	12
LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING	8
TOTAL	20

1. Read the whole piece and decide on a category for CONTENT, PLANNING AND FORMAT.
  2. Re-read the piece and select the appropriate category for LANGUAGE, STYLE AND EDITING.
- Various formats of transactional/referential/informational texts have been taught/are in current practice. This has to be considered when assessing the format.
  - Give credit for appropriateness of format.
  - Look for a logical approach in all writing.

**SECTION A: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING AN ESSAY – HOME LANGUAGE (50)**

	<b>Code 7: Outstanding 80 – 100% <u>24 – 30</u></b>	<b>Code 6: Meritorious 70 – 79% <u>21 – 23½</u></b>	<b>Code 5: Substantial 60 – 69% <u>18 – 20½</u></b>	<b>Code 4: Adequate 50 – 59% <u>15 – 17½</u></b>	<b>Code 3: Moderate 40 – 49% <u>12 – 14½</u></b>	<b>Code 2: Elementary 30 – 39% <u>9 – 11½</u></b>	<b>Code 1: Not achieved 0 – 29% <u>0 – 8½</u></b>
<b>CONTENT &amp; PLANNING (30 MARKS)</b>	-Content outstanding, highly original. -Ideas thought-provoking, mature. -Planning and/or drafting has produced a flawlessly presentable essay.	-Content meritorious, original. -Ideas imaginative, interesting. -Planning and/or drafting has produced a well-crafted and presentable essay.	-Content sound, reasonably coherent. -Ideas interesting, convincing. -Planning and/or drafting has produced a presentable and good essay.	-Content appropriate, adequately coherent. -Ideas interesting, adequately original. -Planning and/or drafting has produced a satisfactory, presentable essay.	-Content mediocre, ordinary. Gaps in coherence. -Ideas mostly relevant. -Limited originality. -Planning and/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable and coherent essay.	-Content not always clear, lacks coherence. -Few ideas, often repetitive. -Inadequate for Home Language level despite planning/drafting. -Essay not well presented.	-Content largely irrelevant. No coherence. -Ideas tedious, repetitive. -Inadequate planning/drafting. -Poorly presented essay.
<b>LANGUAGE, STYLE &amp; EDITING (15 MARKS)</b>	<b><u>12 – 15</u></b> -Critical awareness of impact of language. -Language, punctuation effectively used. -Uses highly appropriate figurative language. -Choice of words exceptional, mature. -Style, tone, register highly suited to topic. -Virtually error-free following proofreading and editing.	<b><u>10½ – 11½</u></b> -Critical awareness of impact of language. -Language, punctuation correct; able to use figurative language. -Choice of words varied and creative. -Style, tone, register appropriately suited to topic. -Largely error-free following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>9 – 10</u></b> -Critical awareness of language evident. -Language and punctuation mostly correct. -Choice of words suited to text. -Style, tone, register suited to topic. -Mostly error-free following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>7½ – 8½</u></b> -Some awareness of impact of language. -Language simplistic, punctuation adequate. -Choice of words adequate. -Style, tone, register generally consistent with topic requirements. -Still contains a few errors following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>6 – 7</u></b> -Limited critical language awareness. -Language mediocre, punctuation often inaccurately used. -Choice of words basic. -Style, tone register lacking in coherence. -Contains several errors following proofreading, editing.	<b><u>4½ – 5½</u></b> -Language and punctuation flawed. -Choice of words limited. -Style, tone, register inappropriate. -Error-ridden despite proofreading, editing.	<b><u>0 – 4</u></b> -Language and punctuation seriously flawed. -Choice of words inappropriate. -Style, tone, register flawed in all aspects. -Error-ridden and confused following proofreading, editing.
<b>STRUCTURE (5 MARKS)</b>	<b><u>4 – 5</u></b> -Coherent development of topic. Vivid, exceptional detail. -Sentences, paragraphs brilliantly constructed. -Length in accordance with requirements of topic.	<b><u>3½</u></b> -Logical development of details. Coherent. -Sentences, paragraphs logical, varied. -Length correct.	<b><u>3</u></b> -Several relevant details developed. -Sentences, paragraphs well constructed. -Length correct.	<b><u>2½</u></b> -Some points, necessary details developed. -Sentences, paragraphing might be faulty in places but essay still makes sense. -Length almost correct.	<b><u>2</u></b> -Most necessary points evident. -Sentences, paragraphs faulty but essay still makes sense. -Length – too long/short.	<b><u>1½</u></b> -Sometimes off topic but general line of thought can be followed. -Sentences, paragraphs constructed at an elementary level. -Length – too long/short.	<b><u>0 – 1</u></b> -Off topic. -Sentences, paragraphs muddled, inconsistent. -Length – far too long/short.

**SECTION B: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING LONGER TRANSACTIONAL TEXT – HOME LANGUAGE (30)**

	<b>Code 7: Outstanding 80 – 100% <u>14½ – 18</u></b>	<b>Code 6: Meritorious 70 – 79% <u>13 – 14</u></b>	<b>Code 5: Substantial 60 – 69% <u>11 – 12½</u></b>	<b>Code 4: Adequate 50 – 59% <u>9 – 10½</u></b>	<b>Code 3: Moderate 40 – 49% <u>7½ – 8½</u></b>	<b>Code 2: Elementary 30 – 39% <u>5½ – 7</u></b>	<b>Code 1: Not achieved 0 – 29% <u>0 – 5</u></b>
<b>CONTENT, PLANNING &amp; FORMAT (18 MARKS)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Extensive specialised knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Disciplined writing – maintains rigorous focus, no digressions.</li> <li>-Total coherence in content and ideas, highly elaborated and all details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a flawlessly presentable text.</li> <li>-Highly appropriate format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Very good knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Disciplined writing – maintains focus, no digressions.</li> <li>-Coherent in content and ideas, very well elaborated and all details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a well-crafted and presentable text.</li> <li>-Has applied the necessary rules of format very well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Fair knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Writing – maintains focus, with minor digressions.</li> <li>-Mostly coherent in content and ideas, elaborated and most details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a presentable and very good text.</li> <li>-Has applied the necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Adequate knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses but does not impede overall meaning.</li> <li>-Adequately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a satisfactorily presentable text.</li> <li>-Has applied an adequate idea of requirements of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Moderate knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>Response to writing task reveals a narrow focus.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses, meaning vague in places.</li> <li>-Moderately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic.</li> <li>-Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable and coherent text.</li> <li>-Has a moderate idea of requirements of format – some critical oversights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Elementary knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>Response to writing task reveals a limited focus.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses, meaning obscure in places.</li> <li>-Not always coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic.</li> <li>-Inadequate planning/drafting. Poorly presented text.</li> <li>-Has not applied necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No knowledge of requirements of text.</li> <li>Response to writing task reveals a limited focus.</li> <li>-Writing – digresses, meaning obscure in places.</li> <li>-Not coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic.</li> <li>-Inadequate planning/drafting. Poorly presented text.</li> <li>-Has not applied necessary rules of format.</li> </ul>
<b>LANGUAGE, STYLE &amp; EDITING (12 MARKS)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grammatically accurate and brilliantly constructed.</li> <li>-Vocabulary highly appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register highly appropriate.</li> <li>-Virtually error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Very well constructed and accurate.</li> <li>-Vocabulary very appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Suitable style, tone, register considering demands of task.</li> <li>-Largely error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Well constructed and easy to read.</li> <li>-Vocabulary appropriate to purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register mostly appropriate.</li> <li>-Mostly error-free following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Adequately constructed. Errors do not impede flow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary adequate for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone, register fairly appropriate.</li> <li>-A few errors following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length almost correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Basically constructed. Several errors.</li> <li>-Vocabulary limited and not very suitable for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Lapses in style, tone and register.</li> <li>-Several errors following proofreading and editing.</li> <li>-Length – too long/short.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Poorly constructed and difficult to follow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary requires some remediation and not suitable for purpose, audience and context.</li> <li>-Style, tone and register inappropriate.</li> <li>-Error-ridden despite proofreading, editing.</li> <li>-Length – too long/short.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Poorly constructed and very difficult to follow.</li> <li>-Vocabulary requires serious remediation and not suitable for purpose.</li> <li>-Style, tone and register do not correspond with topic.</li> <li>-Error-ridden and confused following proofreading, editing.</li> <li>-Length – far too long/short.</li> </ul>

**SECTION C: RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING SHORTER TRANSACTIONAL/REFERENTIAL/INFORMATIONAL TEXT – HOME LANGUAGE (20)**

	<b>Code 7: Outstanding 80 – 100%</b>	<b>Code 6: Meritorious 70 – 79%</b>	<b>Code 5: Substantial 60 – 69%</b>	<b>Code 4: Adequate 50 – 59%</b>	<b>Code 3: Moderate 40 – 49%</b>	<b>Code 2: Elementary 30 – 39%</b>	<b>Code 1: Not achieved 0 – 29%</b>
<b>CONTENT, PLANNING &amp; FORMAT (12 MARKS)</b>	<b>10 – 12</b> -Extensive specialised knowledge of requirements of text. -Exhibits a profound awareness of wider contexts in writing. -Disciplined writing – learner maintains rigorous focus, no digressions. -Total coherence in content and ideas, highly elaborated and all details support topic. -Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a flawlessly presentable text. -Has produced a highly appropriate format.	<b>8½ – 9½</b> -Very good knowledge of requirements of text. -Exhibits a broad awareness of wider contexts in writing. -Disciplined writing – learner maintains focus, no digressions. -Text is coherent in content and ideas, very well elaborated and all details support topic. -Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a well crafted and presentable text. -Has applied the necessary rules of format very well.	<b>7½ – 8</b> -Fair knowledge of requirements of text. -Exhibits a general awareness of wider contexts in writing tasks. -Writing – learner maintains focus, with minor digressions. -Text is mostly coherent in content and ideas, elaborated and most details support topic. -Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a presentable and very good text. -Has applied the necessary rules of format.	<b>6 – 7</b> -Adequate knowledge of requirements of text. -Exhibits some awareness of wider context in writing tasks -Writing – learner digresses but does not impede overall meaning. -Text adequately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic. -Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a satisfactorily presented text. -Has applied an adequate idea of requirements of format.	<b>5 – 5½</b> -Moderate knowledge of requirements of text. -Response to writing task reveals a narrow focus. -Exhibits rather limited knowledge of wider contexts in writing tasks. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning vague in places. -Text moderately coherent in content and ideas, some details support topic. -Evidence of planning and/or drafting has produced a moderately presentable and coherent text. -Has a moderate idea of requirements of format – some critical oversights.	<b>4 – 4½</b> -Elementary knowledge of requirements of text. -Response to writing task reveals a limited focus. -Exhibits a limited knowledge of wider contexts in writing tasks. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning obscure in places. -Text not always coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic. -Inadequate planning/drafting. Poorly presented text. -Has not applied necessary rules of format.	<b>0 – 3½</b> -No knowledge of requirements of text. -Exhibits no knowledge of wider contexts in writing tasks. -Writing – learner digresses, meaning obscure in places. -Text not coherent in content and ideas, has few details which support topic. -Inadequate planning/drafting. Poorly presented text. -Has not applied necessary rules of format.
<b>LANGUAGE, STYLE &amp; EDITING (8 MARKS)</b>	<b>6½ – 8</b> -Text grammatically accurate and brilliantly constructed. -Vocabulary is highly appropriate to purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone, register highly appropriate. -Text virtually error free following proofreading. -Length correct.	<b>6</b> -Text very well constructed and accurate. -Vocabulary very appropriate to purpose, audience and context. -Suitable style, tone and register considering demands of task. -Text largely error-free following proofreading and editing. -Length correct.	<b>5 – 5½</b> -Text well constructed and easy to read. -Vocabulary appropriate to purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone, register mostly appropriate. -Text mostly error-free following proofreading and editing. -Length correct.	<b>4 – 4½</b> -Text adequately constructed. Errors do not impede flow. -Vocabulary adequate for purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone, register fairly appropriate. -Text still contains few errors following and editing. -Length almost correct.	<b>3½</b> -Text is basically constructed. Several errors. -Vocabulary limited and not very suitable for purpose, audience and context. -Lapses in style, tone and register. -Text contains several errors following and editing. -Length – too long/short.	<b>2½ – 3</b> -Text is poorly constructed and difficult to follow. -Vocabulary requires some remediation and not suitable for purpose, audience and context. -Style, tone and register inappropriate. -Text error-ridden despite proofreading, editing. -Length – too long/short.	<b>0 – 2</b> -Text is poorly constructed and very difficult to follow. -Vocabulary requires serious remediation and not suitable for purpose. -Style, tone and register do not correspond with topic. -Text error-ridden and confused following proofreading, editing. -Length – far too long/short.